UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,825	08/25/2003	Yoshinao Nagashima	240950US0DIV	1353
	7590 04/03/200 AK, MCCLELLAND 1	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE STREET			GEMBEH, SHIRLEY V	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1618		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/03/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/646,825	NAGASHIMA ET AL.		
For a modern and			
Examiner	Art Unit		

	SHIRLEY V. GEMBEH	1618					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 11 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i) Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing data liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be assion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	g date of the final rejection of the fee. The appropriate of the fee. The appropriate of the fee. The appropriate of the final Officity of the final rejection, even of the final rejection of the final rejec	e extension fee ate extension fee eate extension fee action; or (2) as wen if timely filed,				
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE beloc) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NO¯ w);	TE below);					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co		•				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 20-24. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		I be entered and an ex	xplanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 							
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other:							
/S. V. G./ Examiner, Art Unit 1618	/Robert C. Hayes/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 1649					

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: (a)The amended claims changes the scope of of the invention which therefore requires further consideration. b) they raise the issue of new matter, because nowhere in the specification is the term "consisting essentially of" contemplated.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claims 20-22 and 24 stand rejected under 102(e) over Surburg et al. (US 6,420,334)

Applicant's argument that the rejection is not a 102(b) but at best a 102(e) is correct and the certified translation of the priority is received and acknowledge. However, the rejection under 102(e) over Surburg stands because it was made under pre AIPA rules; therefore Surburg has priority to July, 1999.

Applicant's arguments have already been addressed in the previous office actions, and are maintained for the reasons of record, or are directed to claim amendments not entered; thereby currently being moot.